



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/554,129	02/02/2006	Tsunco Maruyama	20154/0203468-US0	9359
7278	7590	07/13/2007		
DARBY & DARBY P.C. P.O. BOX 770 Church Street Station New York, NY 10008-0770			EXAMINER ZHU, WEIPING	
			ART UNIT 1742	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/13/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/554,129

Applicant(s)

MARUYAMA ET AL.

Examiner

Weiping Zhu

Art Unit

1742

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date See Continuation Sheet.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :9/19/2006, 2/2/2006 and 10/20/2005.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2002-180162 (translation).

With respect to claims 1-4, JP ('162) discloses a wear resistant bearing for motor fuel pump comprising a Cu-based sintered body of compacted powders having a composition in weight of 1-8% graphite, 0.1-0.9% P and 20-40% Ni and having a porosity of 5-25% (abstract). The content ranges of graphite, P and Ni in the Cu-based sintered body of JP ('162) overlap the claimed respective content ranges (1-5% graphite, 0.1-0.9% P and 17.6-25.2% Ni) and the porosity of the Cu-based sintered body of JP ('162) also overlaps the claimed porosity. A prima facie case of obviousness exists. See MPEP 2144.05 I. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the claimed ranges within the disclosed ranges of JP ('162) with expected success, because JP ('162) discloses the same utility over the entire disclosed ranges.

JP ('162) further discloses that Cu-Ni alloy powder containing different percentages of Ni, Cu-P alloy powder containing 33% of P and graphite powder were blended to make green compacts (paragraph [0010], translation). JP ('162) does not

Art Unit: 1742

specify the content of Ni in the Cu-Ni alloy powder, the content of Cu-P alloy in the powder mixture as claimed and the P content in the Cu-P alloy powder disclosed in the embodiment of JP ('162) is higher than the claimed content in the instant claims 1 and 2. However, it is well held that discovering an optimum value of a result-effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617, F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). In the instant case, the content of Ni in the Cu-Ni alloy, the content of Cu-P alloy in the powder mixture and the content of P in the Cu-P alloy are result-effective variables, because they would directly affect the final contents of Ni and P in the Cu-based sintered body of JP ('162), which would in turn directly affect the corrosion resistance and abrasion resistance respectively of the Cu-based sintered body of JP ('162) as disclosed by JP ('162) (paragraphs [0006 and [0007], translation). Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have optimized the content of Ni in the Cu-Ni alloy and the content of P in the Cu-P alloy in the Cu-based sintered body of JP ('162) in order to achieve desired corrosion and abrasion resistances of the Cu-based sintered ring body. See MPEP 2144.05 II.

JP ('162) further discloses a process for making the wear resistant bearing which is substantially identical to the process as disclosed in the instant disclosure (paragraph [0010], translation).

JP ('162) does not specify the structure features of the Cu-based sintered body as claimed in the instant claim 4. However, it has been well held where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical process, a prima facie case of either

Art Unit: 1742

anticipation or obviousness has been established. In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977), MPEP 2112.01 [R-3] I. In the instant case, the claimed and JP ('162)'s wear resistant bearings are identical or substantially identical in composition and are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, therefore a prima facie case of obviousness exists. The same distributions of pores, P components and free graphite would be expected in the Cu-based sintered body of JP ('162) as in the claimed Cu-based sintered body.

Conclusion

2. This Office action is made non-final. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Weiping Zhu whose telephone number is 571-272-6725. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-16:30 Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1742

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

WZ

7/5/2007


ROY KING
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700